REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 9-11.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner asserts that the limitation of "an action that may affect the type of the item" recited in claims 1 and 9-11 suggests or makes optional, but does not require, steps to be performed and does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. *See* Office Action, page 4.

Applicant amends claims 1 and 9-11 to recite "an action that affects the type of the item," and respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 9-11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sadiq et al. (US 6,032,153), hereinafter Sadiq. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant amends claims 1 and 9-11 to recite "an action that affects the type of the item," as discussed above.

In the Office Action the Examiner asserts that Sadiq discloses all the limitations of claim 1. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Sadiq discloses that a "partial structured query language statement comprises an action that may effect the type of the item." The rejection is based on column 2, lines 2 to 6 of Sadiq. This portion of Sadiq describes a method where a

request is received to update a persistent record of a shared object state, and where the persistent

record of the shared object state is contained in a database.

However, Sadiq neither teaches nor suggests the claimed feature of "retrieving a set of

attributes based on the type of the item and a partial structured query language statement

corresponding to the attributes, wherein the partial structured query language statement

comprises an action that affects the type of the item," as recited in claim 1. Rather, that portion

of Sadiq merely discloses that requests are received to update a persistent record of a shared

object state contained in a database. That portion of Sadiq neither teaches nor suggests that the

partial structured query language statement comprises an action that affects the type of the item,

as that portion of Sadiq discloses nothing about a partial structured query language statement,

much less a partial structured query language statement that affects a type of an item.

Accordingly, Sadiq fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 1, and hence Sadiq does

not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 depend on claim 1, and incorporate by reference all the

limitations of claim 1, and hence Sadiq does not anticipate claims 2 and 3 at least by virtue of

their dependency.

Claims 9-11 recite limitations similar to those discussed above, and hence Sadiq does not

anticipate claims 9-11 for at least analogous reasons. Claim 15 depends on claim 11, and

incorporates by reference all the limitations of claim 11, and hence Sadiq does not anticipate

claim 15 at least by virtue of its dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sadiq in view of Seaman et al. (US 2003/0093433), hereinafter Seaman. Applicant

respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and incorporate by reference all the limitations of claims 1 and 11. Seaman is cited for teaching retrieving a portion of an insert statement. However, even if Sadiq were modified based on Seaman, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would not contain all the limitations of claims 1 and 11, and hence claims 4 and 20, as discussed above. Specifically, the combination would neither teach nor suggest retrieving a set of attributes based on the type of the item and a partial structured query statement corresponding to the attributes, wherein the partial structured query language statement comprises an action that affects the type of the item, as recited in claim 1, or the limitations contained in corresponding language recited in claim 11. Accordingly, the combination of Sadiq and Seaman does not render claims 4 and 20 unpatentable.

Claims 5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadiq in view of Wildermuth (US 5,950,188). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 5 and 19 depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and incorporate by reference all the limitations of claims 1 and 11. Wildermuth is cited for teaching retrieving information that indicates access rights for the structured query language statement. However, even if Sadiq were modified based on Wildermuth, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would not contain all the limitations in claims 1 and 11, and hence claims 5 and 19, as discussed above. Specifically, the combination would neither teach nor suggest retrieving a set of attributes based on the type of the item and a partial structured query statement corresponding to the attributes, wherein the partial structured query language statement comprises an action that affects the type of the item, as recited in claim 1, or the limitations contained in corresponding language recited in claim 11. Accordingly, the combination of Sadiq and Wildermuth does not render claims 5 and 19 unpatentable.

Claims 6 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadiq in view of Reiner et al. (US 6,219,676), hereinafter Reiner. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 6 and 12-14 depend on claims 1 and 11, respectively, and incorporate by reference all the limitations of claims 1 and 11. Reiner is cited for teaching the elements of claims 6 and 12-14. However, even if Sadiq were modified based on Reiner, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would not contain all the limitations of claims 1 and 11, and hence claims 6 and 12-14, as discussed above. Specifically, the combination would neither teach nor suggest retrieving a set of attributes based on the type of the item and a partial structured query statement corresponding to the attributes, wherein the partial structured query language statement comprises an action that affects the type of the item, as recited in claim 1, or the limitations contained in corresponding language recited in claim 11. Accordingly, the combination of Sadiq and Reiner does not render claims 6 and 12-14 unpatentable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

#51,361

J. Warren Lytle, Jr.
Registration No. 39,283

46159

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 10, 2008